



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,177	12/12/2001	Hans-Detlef Arntz	Mo-6837/LeA 33,565	8533

157 7590 06/04/2003

BAYER POLYMERS LLC
100 BAYER ROAD
PITTSBURGH, PA 15205

EXAMINER

SERGEANT, RABON A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1711	8

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/018,177

Applicant(s)

ARNTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Rabon Sergeant

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claims 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Within claim 12, it is unclear if the specified percent values are to sum to 100 percent. It is unclear if the polyester polyol can be derived from additional reactant species. Applicants failed to respond to this issue in the response to the previous Office action.

2. Claims 11-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear that the relative terminology, "oil and petroleum resistant", constitutes a definitive limitation in the absence of any claimed comparison or standard, because it can be argued that any composition will possess a degree of such resistance.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 1711

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 11, 15, 17-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mao ('572).

Patentee discloses the production of flexible polyurethanes, suitable for use in coating, automotive, and fabric coating applications, wherein the polyurethane is produced from a 70:30 to 90:10 weight ratio blend of 1,000-3,000 molecular weight polyether polyol and 1,000-3,000 molecular weight polyester polyol. See columns 2 and 3. Despite applicants' response, patentee discloses an index ratio that meets applicants' claimed ratio. See column 3, lines 53-58 and column 4, lines 54 and 55. The ratio argued by applicants is the ratio of polyisocyanate to polyol, absent the chain extender. Since the disclosed polyurethanes and claimed compositions are produced from equivalent reactants in overlapping ratios, the position is taken that it is logical to conclude that the disclosed polyurethanes inherently possess the same properties as the claimed polyurethanes.

Art Unit: 1711

5. Claims 14, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao ('572).

As aforementioned, Mao discloses the production of polyurethanes, suitable for the production of coatings and moldings, comprising reactants which meet those claimed by applicants; however, Mao is silent regarding the use of the polyurethanes to produce shoe soles and tubing. Still, the position is taken that the production of both shoe soles and tubing from moldable polyurethanes was known at the time of invention, and that it would have been obvious to produce such conventional articles from the disclosed polyurethane compositions.

Furthermore, though Mao is silent regarding the initial combination of the polyester component with the polyisocyanate, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to create an initial admixture of polyisocyanate and one of the polyol components, because one would have reasonably expected the respective polyol species to be incompatible, if mixed with each other.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

R. Sergent
June 1, 2003


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER